### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

JOHN BETTENCOURT,	)	
Plaintiff	)	
	)	
VS.	)	CIVIL ACTION NO.: 05-30179-MAP
	)	
THE TOP-FLITE GOLF COMPANY,	)	
Defendant	)	

## OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE THE AFFIDAVIT OF RICHARD GIELOW

Now comes the plaintiff, John Bettencourt, and opposes the Motion to Strike the Affidavit of Richard Gielow.

The defendant moves to strike portions of the Affidavit of Richard Gielow on grounds that it is "conclusionary". It is difficult to understand exactly what this objection is. The fact that Mr. Gorman, Mr. Duval and Mr. Bosworth were sales management employees who dealt with the Regional Sales Managers, is obvious in many places in the record. Even from the defendant's motion, it is clear defendant does not dispute the fact that all of these individuals would have worked with the Regional Sales Managers and the Regional Sales force. Mr. Gielow's point is simply that to his observation as a Regional Sales Manager, Mr. Gorman was performing Mr. Duval's work. Since Mr. Geilow had a different job than Mr. Gorman, defendant is free to attack the degree and detail of Mr. Gielow's knowledge if it wishes, but that is not a reason to strike the affidavit since Mr. Gielow is competent to testify as to what occurred in the department he worked in. Indeed, Mr. Gielow's testimony is supported in the record by other Company officials including Andrew Kelleher. (Exh. A, pp. 62-67, the "national sales function" was Mr. Gorman)

It is certainly material that Mr. Gielow, Mr. Duval and Mr. Kelleher, all understood Mr. Gorman was taking Mr. Duval's job.

The defendant further objects to Mr. Gielow's assertion that he was replaced by an individual named Chris Reh who was in his thirties. Mr. Gielow explains that he knew Mr. Reh's circumstances because Mr. Reh consulted with him *after* Reh had been hired by Callaway, even though Mr. Gielow had been terminated. Because he later had occasion to hire Mr. Reh, Gielow was familiar with his qualifications and his prior work. Mr. Reh's consultation with Mr. Gielow after he had been hired by Callaway is an admission by Mr. Reh that is binding upon the Company. The entire objection is disingenuous since the Company obviously does not dispute that Mr. Reh was hired to replace Mr. Gielow. The further objection to the remaining information in Paragraph 4 (that Mr. Gielow had in fact later hired Mr. Reh), is frivolous since Mr. Gielow obviously has personal knowledge of his own subsequent work experience and the fact that he hired Mr. Reh. For these reasons, the motion should be denied.

THE DEFENDANT, JOHN BETTENCOURT BY HIS ATTORNEY

Dated: March 9, 2007 / S / Maurice M. Cahillane

Maurice M. Cahillane, Esq. EGAN, FLANAGAN AND COHEN, P.C. 67 Market Street - Post Office Box 9035 Springfield, MA 01102 (413) 737-0260; Fax: (413) 737-0121

BBO# 069660

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a copy of the Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Strike the Affidavit of Richard Gielow was served this 9th day of March, 2007 on all parties, by electronic filing to Jay M. Presser, Esq., Skoler, Abbott & Presser, 1 Monarch Place, Springfield, MA 01144

\_\_\_/ S / Maurice M. Cahillane

12085-050157\131244.wpd

### **EXHIBIT A**

PP. 61-67 - DEPO. OF

R. LEVANDOWSKI

# MICHAEL-BEHAYKOVs. DOTHER OF FLITE GOLLP/COMPANY 2 of 3 ANDREW KELLEHER JULY 28, 2006

63 et to icular but e Sales	
icular but	
with a	
With G	
er of these	,
er or these	
occurred in	n
'04 were	11
04 Were	
ependent	
layoffs?	
•	
in board?	
	h
ffs?	ı
er of the	{
64	
ons?	.
cisions and	•
ns.	
orth came to	.о
ril	-
come to	
come to	
come to	
come to ganization that he	j
come to ganization that he additional	
come to ganization that he	
come to ganization that he additional th	
come to ganization that he additional	
come to ganization that he additional th	
come to panization that he additional th me with a	
come to ganization that he additional th	
come to panization that he additional th me with a	
come to panization that he additional th me with a	
come to panization that he additional th me with a	
nt on Ir.	board? Boswort

**PERLIK and COYLE REPORTING** 

24

A. Mr. Duval's.

consolidated into another function.

# ANDREW KELLEHER JULY 28, 2006

	ANDREW KELLEHE	K	JULY 28, 2006
	65		67
1	Q. What did he tell you?	1	function with a national account management
2	A. That he felt that he could take	2	function.
3	Mr. Duval's function and combine that with the	3	Q. (BY MR. CAHILLANE) Well, did you find
4	national sales function.	4	that odd at all that Mr. Duval who so recently had
5	Q. What was your understanding of	5	come into that department was now being let go?
6	Mr. Duval's function?	6	A. I do not have the I did not have the
7	A. Mr. Duval was performing sales	7	expertise to make any judgment.
8	developing sales and monitoring sales programs.	8	Q. Even as the director of Human Resources?
9	Q. Did he talk to you about anybody else in	9	A. Even as the director of Human Resources.
10	particular?	10	Q. You didn't find anything odd as the
11	A. Not in particular; no.	11	director of Human Resources that someone who had
, 12	Q. Do you know how long Mr. Duval had been	12	just hired someone a matter of a few weeks ago was
13	in that position?	13	now saying that the position was redundant?
14	<ul> <li>A. I do not know specifically but it was</li> </ul>	14	A. No.
15	not very long.	15	Q. The process that had been involved in
16	Q. Do you know who decided to put him in	16	the prior set of layoffs, was Keith Keindel
17	that position?	17	involved in that at all?
18	A. Who? Mr. Duval?	18	A. I don't recall. Actually, yes,
19	Q. Yes; in the position that he was in at	19	Mr. Keindel was involved.
20	the time he was let go?	20	Q. What was his position?
21	A. I believe it was Mr. Rist but I'm not	21	A. I believe Mr. Keindel was had
22	sure.	22	something to do with International the
. 23	Q. Why do you believe that?	23	International business.
24	A. That's what I had heard from	24	Q. Was he at any of those meetings that you
	66		68
1	Mr. Bosworth.	1	described?
2	Q. Do you mean that Mr. Bosworth indicated	2	A. He may have; I do not recall.
3	to you that Mr. Rist had hired Mr. Duval for that	3	Q. Were there any layoffs after the summer
4	position?	4	of '04?
5	A. No; he had recommended Mr. Duval for	5	A. I'm sure there were but I do not recall
6	that position.	6	specifically who they were.
7	Q. To Mr. Bosworth?	7	Q. Did anyone ever tell you that
8	A. Correct.	8	Mr. Bosworth had made statements to regional sales
9	Q. That would not have been Mr. Bosworth's	9	directors about the ages of the employees in the
10	decision to hire him, correct?	10	Sales Department?
11	A. I don't know. That ultimately would be	11	A. No.
12	Mr. Bosworth's decision to hire someone in his	12	Q. Were you present at a meeting at the
13	department.	13	Chicopee Chamber of Commerce in the spring of
14	Q. Since Mr. Bosworth as you recall arrived	14	2004?
15	there after April of '04 or after April 15th and	15	A. Yes.
16	Mr. Duval was let go in the summer, that would	16	Q. Was this a meeting where Top-Flite was
17	mean that Mr. Bosworth hired him in the spring and	17	featured?
18	by the summer had decided that his position was	18	A. Yes.
19	redundant?	19	Q. Were you present at the head table so to
20	MR. PRESSER: Objection.	20	speak at that meeting?
21	THE WITNESS: I don't know why	21	A. Yes.
22	Mr. Bosworth would come up with that decision	22	Q. Did Mr. Penicka speak?
23	since well, I believe the decision to terminate	23	A. Yes.
24	Mr. Duval was associated with combining his	24	Q. Did anyone else speak on behalf of

PERLIK and COYLE REPORTING